arXiv:1603.08472v1 [math.AT] 28 Mar 2016

Topology and combinatorics of 'unavoidable complexes'

Duško Jojić
Faculty of Science, University of Banja Luka

Siniša T. Vrećica*
Faculty of Mathematics, University of Belgrade

Rade T. Živaljević†
Mathematics Institute SASA, Belgrade

March 21, 2016

Abstract

The partition number $\pi(K)$ of a simplicial complex $K \subset 2^{[m]}$ is the minimum integer ν such that for each partition $A_1 \uplus \ldots \uplus A_\nu = [m]$ of $[m]$ at least one of the sets A_i is in K. A complex K is r-unavoidable if $\pi(K) \leq r$. We say that a complex K is globally r-non-embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if for each continuous map $f : |K| \to \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist r vertex disjoint faces $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of $|K|$ such that $f(\sigma_1) \cap \ldots \cap f(\sigma_r) \neq \emptyset$. Motivated by the problems of Tverberg-Van Kampen-Flores type we prove several results (Theorems 3.6, 3.9, 4.6) which link together the combinatorics and topology of these two classes of complexes. One of our central observations (Theorem 4.6), summarizing and extending results of G. Schild, B. Grünbaum and many others, is that interesting examples of (globally) r-non-embeddable complexes can be found among the joins $K = K_1 * \ldots * K_s$ of r-unavoidable complexes.

1 Introduction

Unavoidable or more precisely 2-*unavoidable simplicial complexes* can be directly linked to some classes of simplicial complexes which (often independently) emerged and attracted attention of researchers in *game theory, combinatorial topology, social choice theory, reliability theory*, *geometry of moduli spaces of polygonal linkages*, and other areas. In topology [M03] they appear as the Alexander self-dual complexes, and provide key examples of n-dimensional complexes non-embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. In social choice

*Supported by the Ministry for Science and Technology of Serbia, Grant 174034.
†Supported by the Ministry for Science and Technology of Serbia, Grant 174034.

theory (reliability theory) [vNM44, R90, PS07] they arise as the complexes describing the winning (losing) coalitions in game theory ('simple games' of Von Neumann and Morgenstern [vNM44]). In geometry of configuration spaces [Ga-Pa] they arise as the complexes of 'short sets', characterizing the configuration spaces of polygonal linkages in Euclidean spaces. Motivated by the 'constraint method' of Gromov [G10], and Blagojević, Frick, and Ziegler [BFZ], we introduce and study a more general class of r-unavoidable complexes. Our primary motivation is the quest for more 'exotic' examples of theorems of Tverberg-Van Kampen-Flores type. However it may be expected that the invariant $\pi(K)$ and the associated r-unavoidable complexes are as important and interesting for other fields as their 2-unavoidable counterparts.

1.1 The 'constraint method' of [BFZ] and [G10]

The method of 'Tverberg unavoidable complexes' or the 'constraint method', as introduced and developed in [BFZ] by Blagojević, Frick, and Ziegler, and earlier (in a less explicit form) by Gromov [G10], has already proven to be a powerful and versatile method for generating statements of Tverberg type.

Among the spectacular application of the method is the recent announcement [F] of a counterexample to the general non-linear Tverberg conjecture, see also the more detailed account [BFZ-2]. As it turned out, this step was already made by Gromov [G10, Section 2.9] who (on page 445), in the Section 2.9(c), outlined how *'the topological Tverberg theorem, whenever available, implies the Van Kampen-Flores theorem'*.

In a seminal work [MW14, MW15] (see also the subsequent publications [AMSW, MW16]) I. Mabillard and U. Wagner developed a version of 'Whitney trick' for eliminating global r-fold points and obtained first counterexamples to the Van Kampen-Flores theorem (when r is not a prime power).

This, in light of [G10], led to the first counterexamples to the 'continuous Tverberg conjecture', although it appears that Frick [F] (unaware of [G10]) was the first to disseminate the news to the larger combinatorial audience.

However, here we would like to emphasize that one of the key contributions of [BFZ] (the paper that served as a basis for [F]) was the introduction of 'Tverberg unavoidable complexes' (see Definition 2.1 in Section 2). This concept and its far reaching and beautiful applications were our main motivation for introducing the 'partition number' $\pi(K)$ and to explore the class of r-unavoidable complexes, as combinatorially interesting objects that deserve to be studied in their own right.

1.2 This paper

Motivated by the problems of Tverberg-Van Kampen-Flores type we prove several results (Theorems 3.6, 3.9, 4.6) which link the combinatorics of r-unavoidable complexes to the topology of globally r-non-embeddable complexes.

The main idea is to compare the combinatorial complexity of a simplicial complex K (expressed in terms of the invariant $r = \pi(K)$) to the (equivariant) topological

complexity of the associated deleted join K_Δ^{*r} (or deleted product K_Δ^r) evaluated by an associated equivariant index $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp$. This comparison is illustrated by the inequalities proved in Theorems 3.6 and 3.9. For example, a corollary of Theorem 3.6 (Corollary 3.7) says that there is an inequality,

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(K_\Delta^{*r}) \geq m - \pi(K) \tag{1}$$

where $r = \pi(K) = p^k$ is a prime power, $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^k$, and $K \subset 2^{[m]}$.

Our central result is Theorem 4.6. By summarizing and extending several results of Grünbaum, Sarkaria, Schild, Blagojević, Frick, Ziegler, as well as our own work, we demonstrate that many interesting examples of globally r-non-embeddable complexes can be found among the joins $K = K_1 * \ldots * K_s$ of r-unavoidable complexes.

These observations and results provide additional evidence that the r-unavoidable complexes are an interesting class of combinatorial objects that deserve an independent study. In the final sections of the paper we outline and explore several schemes for generating such complexes. The picture is far from being complete and we plan to give a more detailed presentation of interesting examples of r-unavoidable complexes in a subsequent publication.

2 The invariant $\pi(K)$ and r-unavoidable complexes

The following definition (Definition 4.1 in [BFZ, Section 4]) is central for the 'constraint method' or the method of 'Tverberg unavoidable complexes'.

Definition 2.1. (Tverberg unavoidable subcomplexes). *Let $r \geq 2, d \geq 1, N \geq r-1$ be integers and $f : \Delta_N \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous map with at least one Tverberg r-partition. Then, a subcomplex $\Sigma \subset \Delta_N$ is* Tverberg unavoidable *if for every Tverberg partition $\{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r\}$ for f, there is at least one face σ_j that lies in Σ.*

As remarked in [BFZ, Section 4], the property of being 'Tverberg unavoidable' (as introduced in Definition 2.1) depends both on the parameters r, d and N, and on the chosen map f. However, the authors of [BFZ] emphasized that their main interest in that paper were the subcomplexes that are large enough to be unavoidable for any continuous map f.

In the following closely related Definition 2.2 we prefer to avoid any reference to a continuous map $f : \Delta_N \to \mathbb{R}^d$ whatsoever, and in particular to the parameters d and N. As a consequence our definition is more general and our class of r-unavoidable complexes is probably larger than the original class of Tverberg unavoidable complexes.

Definition 2.2. (r-unavoidable complexes) *Let $r \geq 2$ be an integer. Suppose that K is a simplicial complex with vertices in $[m]$, meaning that $Vert(K) \subset [m]$. The complex K is called r-unavoidable on $[m]$* (or simply r-unavoidable) *if,*

$$\forall A_1, \ldots, A_r \in 2^{[m]} \setminus \{\emptyset\}, \quad A_1 \uplus \ldots \uplus A_r \subset [m] \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\exists i)\, A_i \in K. \tag{2}$$

If $K \subset L \subset 2^{[m]}$ and the complex K is r-unavoidable then L is r-unavoidable as well. This is the reason why it may be sometimes useful to focus on 'minimal r-unavoidable complexes'.

Definition 2.3. *A complex $K \subset 2^{[m]}$ is* minimally r-unavoidable *if it is r-unavoidable and if $L \subsetneq K$ is a proper subcomplex of K then L is not r-unavoidable.*

The property of being r-unavoidable is an intrinsic, combinatorial property of the simplicial complex K. Here is a natural generalization.

Definition 2.4. ((r,s)-unavoidable complexes) *Choose integers $r > s \geq 1$. Suppose that $Vert(K) \subset [m]$. The complex K is called* (r,s)-unavoidable *if,*

$$\forall A_1, \ldots, A_r \in 2^{[m]} \setminus \{\emptyset\}, \quad A_1 \uplus \ldots \uplus A_r \subset [m] \quad \Rightarrow \quad |K \cap \{A_i\}_{i=1}^r| \geq s. \qquad (3)$$

In other words the condition (3) says that for each partition $\uplus_{i=1}^r A_i = [m]$ of $[m]$ into r non-empty sets, at least s of the sets A_i belong to K.

Perhaps the most elegant way to introduce the r-unavoidable complexes is via the 'partition invariant' $\pi(K)$. Note that by assuming $K \subset 2^{[m]}$ we mean that $\mathrm{Vert}(K) \subset [m]$ and that this inclusion may be strict in general.

Definition 2.5. *The partition number $\pi(K)$ of a simplicial complex $K \subset 2^{[m]}$ is the minimum integer ν such that for each partition $A_1 \uplus \ldots \uplus A_\nu = [m]$ of $[m]$ at least one of the sets A_i is in K. More generally, if $\mathcal{H} \subset 2^{[m]}$ is an arbitrary set (hypergraf) then the associated $\mathcal{H}$-partition number $\pi_{\mathcal{H}}(K)$ of K is defined as the minimum integer ν such that for each partition $A_1 \uplus \ldots \uplus A_\nu = [m]$ of $[m]$ with elements $A_i \in \mathcal{H}$, at least one of the sets A_i is in K.*

3 Equivariant index and r-unavoidable complexes

In this section we establish a connection between r-unavoidable complexes and the equivariant index theory [M03, Ž04].

For the reader's convenience we include the definition and outline the main properties of the modified (sharpened) numerical index function $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp$ for the elementary abelian p-group $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^k$ described in [JVZ-2, Proposition 6.4]. The sharpened index function agrees with the usual index function Ind_G (as described in [M03]) if $G = \mathbb{Z}_p$ and has the merit to assign 'correct values' to some important spaces (spheres) with fixed point free $(\mathbb{Z}_p)^k$-actions.

As envisaged in [Živ98], the equivariant index theory can be understood as a kind of complexity theory for G-complexes. It provides a source of 'Borsuk-Ulam' type results needed for the application of the *Configuration space/test map scheme* [Živ98, Ž04] and in this sense it can be used as a 'black box' for immediate applications in discrete geometry and combinatorics.

3.1 Abstract index theory in a nutshell

We are primarily interested in the category G-Top of G-spaces and G-maps where $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\alpha$ is an elementary abelian p-group. Before we construct the index function $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp$ it may be useful to recall some basic ideas of 'abstract index theory'.

Suppose that $\mathcal{M} = (Ob_{\mathcal{M}}, Mor_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a category and let $S \subset Ob(\mathcal{M})$ be a set of objects in $\mathcal{M}$. The S-index is by definition the set $I_S(x) := \{c \in S \mid Mor_{\mathcal{M}}(x,c) \neq \emptyset\}$. The key (tautological) property of the index is that the existence of a morphism $x \to y$ in $\mathcal{M}$ implies $I_S(y) \subset I_S(x)$. The converse is in general not true, however note that if $y \in S$ then $I_S(y) \subset I_S(x)$ implies $y \in I_S(x)$ and $Mor_{\mathcal{M}}(x,y) \neq \emptyset$.

Some of the central examples of index functions arise if $S = \{a_m\}_{m=0}^\infty$ is a sequence of objects in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $Mor_{\mathcal{M}}(a_i, a_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset = Mor_{\mathcal{M}}(a_{i+1}, a_i)$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In this case $I_S(x)$ (if non-empty) is an interval $[m, +\infty) \subset \mathbb{N}_0$. The integer $m =: \mathrm{Ind}_S(x)$ is referred to as the (numerical) S-index of $x \in Ob_{\mathcal{M}}$ and by definition $\mathrm{Ind}_S(x) = +\infty$ if $I_S(x) = \emptyset$.

3.2 The $(\mathbb{Z}_p)^\alpha$-index function $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X)$

Let $r = p^\alpha$ be a prime power and let $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\alpha$ be an elementary abelian p-group. Let $V = \mathbb{R}[G]$ be the real regular representation and $W = V/V^G$ the associated representation obtained by modding out the 1-dimensional representation $V^G = \mathbb{R} \cdot \omega$ of G-fixed points, $\omega = \sum_{g \in G} g$. Then $\dim(W) = r - 1$ and the sphere $S^{r-2} = S(W)$ is the space where G acts without fixed points.

We use the abbreviation $X \xrightarrow{G} Y$ if there exists a G-equivariant map $f : X \to Y$ and $X \xrightarrow{G} \!\!\!\!\!\!\diagup\; Y$ in the opposite case.

Definition 3.1. *For $0 \leq n < r-2$ let $A_nG = [r]^{*(n+1)}$. If $n = (r-1)d - 1$ for some d then by definition $A_nG = S^{(r-1)d-1} = (S^{r-2})^{*d} = S(W)^{*d}$. If $n = (r-1)d - 1 + k$ for some $0 < k < r-1$ let $A_nG = S^{(r-1)d-1} * [r]^{*k}$.*

Lemma 3.2.

$$A_mG * A_nG \xrightarrow{G} A_{m+n+1}G \tag{4}$$

Proof: Let us assume, initially, that both $m < r-2$ and $n < r-2$, so by Definition 3.1 $A_mG = [r]^{*(m+1)}$ and $A_nG = [r]^{*(n+1)}$. Since the relation $[r]^{*(m+n+2)} \xrightarrow{G} X$ holds for each $(m+n)$-connected G-complex X it must be true for $X = A_{m+n+1}$, which is precisely the relation (4).

In the general case $A_mG \cong (S^{r-2})^{*p_1} * [r]^{q_1+1}$ and $A_nG \cong (S^{r-2})^{*p_2} * [r]^{q_2+1}$ there are two possibilities. If $q_1 + q_2 + 1 < r - 2$ then $A_mG * A_nG \cong A_{m+n+1}G$ and the relation (4) is trivially satisfied. In the opposite case $q_1 + q_2 + 1 \geq r - 2$ there exist decompositions,

$$A_mG * A_nG \cong Y * [r]^{*(r-1)} \qquad A_{m+n+1}G \cong Y * S^{r-2}$$

for some G-complex Y. In this case (4) is again a consequence of one of the basic relations $[r^{*(r-1)}] \xrightarrow{G} S^{r-2}$. $\square$

The sequence $\{A_nG\}_{n=0}^{+\infty}$ can be used, following the scheme outlined in Section 3.1, for the construction of a numerical index function $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp$ defined on the category $\mathcal{C}_G$ of G-simplicial complexes and G-equivariant maps.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $r = p^\alpha$ be a prime power and let $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\alpha$ be an elementary abelian p-group. Let $\mathcal{C}_G$ be the category of finite, not necessarily free G-complexes with G-equivariant maps as morphisms. Then the associated index function, defined on $\mathcal{C}_G$ by the formula:*

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X) := \ \mathrm{Inf}\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{+\infty\} \mid X \xrightarrow{G} A_nG\} \tag{5}$$

has the following properties.

(1) $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{+\infty\}$.

(2) $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X) < +\infty$ *if X is a free G-simplicial complex.*

(3) *If* $X \xrightarrow{G} Y$ *then* $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X) \leq \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(Y)$.

(4) $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X * Y) \leq \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X) + \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(Y) + 1$.

(5) *If X is $(n-1)$-connected then* $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X) \geq n$.

(6) *If X is free and* $\dim(X) \leq n$ *then* $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X) \leq n$.

(7) (Sarkaria's inequality) *If L_0 is free and $L \subset L_0$ is G-invariant then,*

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(L) \geq \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(L_0) - \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(\Delta(L_0 \setminus L)) - 1.$$

(8) $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(A_nG) = n$ *or equivalently* $A_nG \xrightarrow{G} A_{n-1}G$.

(9) *If $r = p$ is a prime then* $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(X) = \mathrm{Ind}_G(X)$.

The reader familiar with [M03, Section 6.2.] should not have difficulties verifying most of the properties (1)-(9) of the function $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp$. For example (4) is a consequence of Lemma 3.2. One of the less obvious is the property (5) which incorporates a Borsuk-Ulam type result of Volovikov (see [Vol96] or [M03, Section 6.2]). Note that we can initially assume that X is a *free*, $(n-1)$-connected G-complex. The function Ind_G which appears in (9) is the 'usual index function', as described in [Živ98, M03, Ž04].

The most important for applications is the property (7), known as the Sarkaria's (or Sarkaria-Živaljević [Živ98, M03]) inequality.

Proposition 3.4. (Sarkaria's inequality) *Let $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^k$ be an elementary abelian p-group. Suppose that L_0 is a finite G-simplicial complex and $L \subset L_0$ its G-invariant subcomplex. Then,*

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(L) \geq \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(L_0) - \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(\Delta(L_0 \setminus L)) - 1, \tag{6}$$

where $\Delta(L_0 \setminus L)$ is the order complex of the poset $(L_0 \setminus L, \subset)$.

Proof: The relation (6) is in light of (4) an immediate consequence of,

$$\Delta(L_0) \xrightarrow{G} \Delta(L) * \Delta(L_0 \setminus L).$$

The following extension of Proposition 3.4 will be needed in the proof of Theorem 3.9.

Proposition 3.5. ([Ž15]) *Let $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^k$ be an elementary abelian p-group. Suppose that P is a finite (not necessarily free) G-simplicial poset and let $P_0 \subset P$ be its initial, G-invariant subposet. Let $P_1 = P \setminus P_0$ be the complementary subposet of P. Assume that $\mathcal{D} : P \to Top$ is a G-diagram of spaces with G-action on $\mathcal{D}$ compatible with the action on P and let $\mathcal{D}_0$ and $\mathcal{D}_1$ be the restrictions of this diagram on P_0 and P_1 respectively. Then,*

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(\|\mathcal{D}_0\|) \geq \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(\|\mathcal{D}\|) - \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(\|\mathcal{D}_1\|) - 1, \tag{7}$$

where $\|\mathcal{E}\| = \mathbf{hocolim}(\mathcal{E})$ is the homotopy colimit of the diagram $\mathcal{E}$.

3.3 Deleted joins of r-unavoidable complexes

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that K is an r-unavoidable complex with vertices in $[m]$. Suppose that $r = p^k$ is a prime power and let $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^k$ be an elementary abelian p-group acting freely on the set $[r]$. Let K_Δ^{*r} be the r-fold (2-wise) deleted join of K. Then,*

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(K_\Delta^{*r}) \geq m - r. \tag{8}$$

More generally, if K is (r, s)-unavoidable then,

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(K_\Delta^{*r}) \geq m - r + s - 1. \tag{9}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.6: We apply the 'Sarkaria's inequality' (6) (Proposition 3.4). Let $\Delta([m]) \cong \Delta^{m-1}$ be the $(m-1)$-dimensional simplex spanned by $[m]$ and let $L_0 = \Delta([m])_\Delta^{*r}$. Since,

$$L_0 = \Delta([m])_\Delta^{*r} \cong [r]^{*m},$$

is an $(m-1)$-dimensional, $(m-2)$-connected, free G-complex, we observe that $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(L_0) = m - 1$.

If $L = K_\Delta^{*r}$ then $L_0 \setminus L$ can be described as the set of all simplices $(A_1, \ldots, A_r) \in L_0$ such that not all A_i belong to K. In other words $\tau = (A_1, \ldots, A_r) \in L_0 \setminus L$ if and only if,

$$\phi(\tau) = \phi(A_1, \ldots, A_r) \stackrel{def}{=} \{i \in [r] \mid A_i \notin K\} \neq \emptyset. \tag{10}$$

Observe that $\phi(\tau) \neq [r]$ since by assumption K is r-unavoidable. Let $\partial([r]) = \{A \subset [r] \mid \emptyset \neq A \neq [r]\}$ be the boundary poset of the simplex $\Delta([r])$. The map,

$$\phi : L_0 \setminus L \to \partial([r]) \tag{11}$$

is clearly monotone and G-equivariant, so it induces a G-equivariant map of order complexes,

$$\hat{\phi} : \Delta(L_0 \setminus L) \to \Delta(\partial([r])). \tag{12}$$

Since $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(\Delta(\partial([r]))) = \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(S^{r-2}) = r-2$, by the monotonicity of the index function we observe that, $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(\Delta(L_0 \setminus L)) \leq r-2$ and the inequality (8) as an immediate consequence of the Sarkaria's inequality (6). □

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose that K is a simplicial complex such that* $\mathrm{Vert}(K) \subset [m]$. *If $r = \pi(K) = p^k$ is a prime power and $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^k$ then,*

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(K_\Delta^{*r}) \geq m - \pi(K). \tag{13}$$

Example 3.8. The van Kampen-Flores theorem [M03, Theorem 5.1.1] says that the n-skeleton Δ_{2n+2}^n of the $(2n+2)$-dimensional simplex is not embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Here we deduce this result from Theorem 3.6.

The complex Δ_{2n+2}^n is self-dual (minimally 2-unavoidable), hence by Theorem 3.6 $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{Z}_2}((\Delta_{2n+2}^n)_\Delta^{*2}) \geq (2n+3) - 2 = 2n+1$. If Δ_{2n+2}^n were embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ then there would exist a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-equivariant map $F : (\Delta_{2n+2}^n)_\Delta^{*2} \to \mathbb{R}^{4n+1} \setminus \mathbb{R}^{2n} \simeq S^{2n}$ which contradicts the fact that $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(S^{2n}) = 2n$.

3.4 Deleted products of r-unavoidable complexes

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose that $r = p^k$ is a prime power and let K be an r-unavoidable complex with vertices in $[m]$. Suppose that $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^k$. Let K_Δ^r be the r-fold (2-wise) deleted product of K. Then,*

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(K_\Delta^r) \geq m - 2r + 1. \tag{14}$$

More generally, if K is (r,s)-unavoidable then,

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(K_\Delta^r) \geq m - 2r + s. \tag{15}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.9: Let P be the face poset of the simplex $\Delta([r])$ spanned by $[r]$ as the set of vertices and let $P_0 = \{\hat{1}\}$ its one-element subposet where $\hat{1} = [m]$ (the maximal element of P). Let $P_1 = P \setminus P_0 = P \setminus \{\hat{1}\}$. Let $\mathcal{D} : P \to Top$ be the diagram defined by $\mathcal{D}(A) = K_\Delta^A$ where $K_\Delta^A \cong K_\Delta^{|A|}$ is the A-deleted product of K (topologized

as a subspace of $K^{[r]}$). More explicitly a function $f : A \to K$ is in K^A_Δ if and only if the supports (in $\Delta([r])$) of all points $f(i)$ are pairwise disjoint. Let $\mathcal{D}_0$ and $\mathcal{D}_1$ be the restriction of this diagram to posets P_0 and P_1.

It is not difficult to see [Ž98, Section 3.4.] that the homotopy colimit of this diagram is the deleted join of K,

$$\|\mathcal{D}\| = \mathbf{hocolim}(\mathcal{D}) \cong K^{*r}_\Delta. \tag{16}$$

Moreover $\|\mathcal{D}_0\| \cong K^r_\Delta$ is the deleted product of K.

Let $\mathcal{C} : P_1 \to Top$ be the constant diagram where $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is a one-element set for each $A \in P_1$. The obvious map (morphism) of diagrams $\mathcal{D}_1 \to \mathcal{C}$ induces a G-equivariant map,

$$\|\mathcal{D}_1\| = \mathbf{hocolim}(\mathcal{D}_1) \to \mathbf{hocolim}(\mathcal{C}) \cong \Delta(P_1) \cong S^{r-2}. \tag{17}$$

By the monotonicity of the index function we conclude from (17) that $\mathrm{Ind}^\sharp_G(\|\mathcal{D}_1\|) \leq r-2$. By Theorem 3.6 $\mathrm{Ind}^\sharp_G(K^{*r}_\Delta) \geq m-r$. Finally by the index inequality 3.5,

$$\mathrm{Ind}^\sharp_G(K^r_\Delta) \geq (m-r) - (r-2) - 1 = m - 2r + 1.$$

The second part of the proposition is proved similarly so we omit the details. □

4 Almost r-embeddings and r-unavoidable complexes

Suppose that K is a finite simplicial complex and let $X = |K|$ be the underlying topological space. A map $f : X \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is an embedding if it is 1–1. We say that $f : |K| \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is an **almost embedding** if $f(\Delta_1) \cap f(\Delta_2) = \emptyset$ for each pair Δ_1, Δ_2 of vertex disjoint simplices in K. In other words a map is an embedding (almost embedding) if it does not have a 2-fold (global 2-fold) point. It is natural to extend this definition to the general case of maps which do not admit (global) r-fold points.

Definition 4.1. *A map $X \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is an r-embedding if it has no r-fold points, i.e. there are at most $(r-1)$ points in the pre-image $f^{-1}(y)$ for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A map $f : K \to \mathbb{R}^d$ without* **global r-fold points** *is called an* **almost r-embedding** *(or global r-embedding). By definition $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a global r-fold point if there exist vertex disjoint simplices $\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_r$ in K such that $y \in f(\Delta_i)$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$.*

Isaac Mabillard and Uli Wagner opened a new chapter of the theory of almost r-embeddings by introducing and developing a version of 'Whitney trick' for eliminating global r-fold points. The following theorem was originally announced in [MW14] with the complete presentation given in [MW15], see also [AMSW, MW16] for the subsequent development.

Theorem 4.2. (I. Mabillard, U. Wagner [MW14, MW15]) *Suppose that $r \geq 2, k \geq 3$, and let K be a simplicial complex of dimension $(r-1)k$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *There exists an S_r-equivariant map $F : K_\Delta^{\times r} \to S(W_r^{\oplus rk})$.*

(ii) *There exists a continuous map $f : K \to \mathbb{R}^{rk}$ such that $f(\sigma_1) \cap \cdots \cap f(\sigma_r) = \emptyset$ for each collection of pairwise disjoint faces $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of K.*

The following result of Murad Özaydin was never formally published but its preprint from 1987 was widely circulated.

Theorem 4.3. (M. Özaydin [Öz87]) *Assume $d \geq 1$ and $r \geq 2$. Let S_r be the symmetric group and let $E_{S_r}^{d(r-1)}$ be a $[d(r-1)-1]$-connected, free S_r-simplicial complex. Then there exists an S_r-equivariant map,*

$$f : E_{S_r}^{d(r-1)} \xrightarrow{S_r} S^{d(r-1)-1} \tag{18}$$

if and only if r is not *a prime power.*

Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3 together explain why it is in general necessary to assume that $r = p^k$ is a prime power in the Van Kampen-Flores type results. This will be one of our standard assumptions throughout all of Section 4.1.

4.1 The general Tverberg-Van Kampen-Flores problem

Definition 4.4. *(Cont. of Definition 4.1) We say that a simplicial complex K is* globally r-non-embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^d$ *(or globally (r,d)-non-embeddable) if there does not exist a map $f : |K| \to \mathbb{R}^d$ without global r-fold points. The general Tverberg-Van Kampen-Flores problem is to find interesting examples of globally (r,d)-non-embeddable complexes and to study (characterize) the class $TvKF(r,d)$ of all simplicial complexes which are globally r-non-embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

The following theorem of G. Schild illustrates the importance of 2-unavoidable (self-dual) complexes for the instance $r = 2$ of the general Tverberg-Van Kampen-Flores problem. In the special case when K_i are Van Kampen-Flores complexes $\Delta_{2n_i+2}^{n_i}$ (Example 3.8) this result was proved by B. Grünbaum, so Theorem 4.5 is sometimes referred to as the Van Kampen-Flores-Grüunbaum-Schild non-embedding theorem. Sergey Melikhov [Mel11] discovered an interesting connection of this result (and its relatives) with the so called *dichotomial cell complexes* (dichotomial spheres).

Theorem 4.5. (G. Schild [Sc93], B. Grünbaum [Gr69]) *Let $K = K_1 * \ldots * K_s$ where each K_i is a self-dual subcomplex of the simplex $\Delta^{m_i-1} = \Delta([m_i])$ spanned by m_i vertices. Then K is not embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^d$ where,*

$$d \leq m_1 + \ldots + m_s - s - 2. \tag{19}$$

It is clear that we can replace in Theorem 4.5 self-dual complexes by 2-unavoidable complexes. Indeed, the 2-unavoidable complexes which are minimal (in the sense that each proper subcomplex $K' \subset K$ is not 2-unavoidable) are precisely the self-dual complexes. For this reason the following theorem is a direct generalization of Theorem 4.5 to the case of r-unavoidable complexes.

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose that $r = p^k$ is a prime power. Let $K = K_1 * \ldots * K_s$ where each K_i is an r-unavoidable subcomplex of the simplex $\Delta^{m_i-1} = \Delta([m_i])$ spanned by m_i vertices. Then K is not embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^d$ if the dimension d satisfies the inequality,*

$$(r-1)(d+s+1)+1 \leq m_1 + \ldots + m_s. \tag{20}$$

Proof: The operation of the r-th deleted join commutes with the standard joins (see the proof of Lemma 5.5.2 in [M03]) so there is an isomorphism,

$$K_\Delta^{*r} = (K_1 * \cdots * K_s)_\Delta^{*r} \cong (K_1)_\Delta^{*r} * \cdots * (K_s)_\Delta^{*r}. \tag{21}$$

If there exists an almost r-embedding $f : K \to \mathbb{R}^d$ then there is an associated S_r-equivariant map,

$$K_\Delta^{*r} \xrightarrow{F} (\mathbb{R}^d)_\Delta^{*r} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{dr+r-1} \setminus \mathbb{R}^d \simeq S^{(r-1)(d+1)-1} \tag{22}$$

The target space is $S^{(r-1)(d+1)-1} = (S^{r-2})^{*(d+1)} = A_N G$, where $N = (r-1)(d+1)-1$, so it's $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp$-index is equal to N.

In light of the monotonicity property of the $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp$-index (Proposition 3.3, part (3)), it is sufficient to check the inequality,

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(K_\Delta^{*r}) \geq N+1 = (r-1)(d+1). \tag{23}$$

We already know (Theorem 3.6) that $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp((K_i)_\Delta^{*r}) \geq m_i - r$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, s$. Hence, in light of (21), it may be tempting to apply a result similar to the inequality (3) in Proposition 3.3. Unfortunately this inequality points in a 'wrong direction' and in general cannot be improved to the equality. For this reason we go back to the idea of the proof of Theorem 3.6 and use directly the Proposition 3.4 (Sarkaria's inequality).

By adding a 'slack index' we can see K_j as a complex with vertices in $[m_j] \times \{j\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$. Then (in light of (21)) a simplex $A \in K_\Delta^{*r}$ can be described as a collection $A = (A_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in[r]\times[s]}$ where,

(1) $A_{i,j} \subset [m_j] \times \{j\}$ is a simplex in K_j,

(2) $(\forall j = 1, \ldots, s)(\forall i_1 \neq i_2) \quad A_{i_1,j} \cap A_{i_2,j} = \emptyset$,

(3) $\bigcup_{(i,j)\in[r]\times[s]} A_{i,j} \neq \emptyset$.

In other words K is naturally interpreted as a subcomplex of the simplex $\Delta(S) \cong \Delta([m]) \cong \Delta^{m-1}$ spanned by S where $S = \cup_{j=1}^s [m_j] \times \{j\}$ and $m = m_1 + \ldots + m_s$.

Let $L_0 = \Delta(S)_\Delta^{*r} \cong [r]^{*m}$ which implies the inequality $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(L_0) \geq m-1$. Let $L = K_\Delta^{*r}$. Then $L_0 \setminus L$ is the collection $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_r) \in L_0 = \Delta(S)_\Delta^{*r}$ such that $A_i \notin K$ for at least one $i \in [r]$. Let $A_{i,j} = A_i \cap ([m_j] \times \{j\})$. Then, $A = (A_{i,j})_{(i,j)\in[r]\times[s]}$ is in $L_0 \setminus L$ if and only if,

(1) $(\exists i \in [r])(\exists j \in [s]) \quad A_{i,j} \notin K_j$,

(2) $(\forall j \in [s])(\forall i_1 \neq i_2) \quad A_{i_1,j} \cap A_{i_2,j} = \emptyset$,

(3) $\bigcup_{(i,j)\in[r]\times[s]} A_{i,j} \neq \emptyset$.

For a given $A \in K_\Delta^{*r}$, let $\phi_j(A) = \{i \in [r] \mid A_{i,j} \notin K_j\}$. Since K_j is r-unavoidable, $\phi_j(A) \in \partial\Delta([r]) \cong S^{r-2}$. Moreover, there is monotone map (of $\subseteq$-posets),

$$\phi = \phi_1 \uplus \ldots \uplus \phi_s : L_0 \setminus L \longrightarrow (\partial\Delta([r]))^{*s} \tag{24}$$

which, in light of the isomorphism $(\partial\Delta([r]))^{*s} \cong (S^{r-2})^{*s} = A_{(r-1)s-1}$, implies that $\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(\Delta(L_0 \setminus L)) \leq (r-1)s-1$. Together with the Sarkaria's inequality this implies,

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(L) \geq m-1-[(r-1)s-1]-1 = m-(r-1)s-1. \tag{25}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem since the inequality (23) is an immediate consequence of (20) and (25). □

Example 4.7. ([VŽ94]) The 0-dimensional complex $L = [5]$ is clearly 3-unavoidable. It follows from Theorem 4.6 that the complex $K = [5]*[5]*[5]$ is not globally embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Informally speaking we claim that for each constellation of red, blue and white stars in the outer space there exist three intersecting, vertex disjoint triangles with vertices formed by the stars of different color. This result is an instance of the *type B* colored Tverberg theorem of Vrećica and Živaljević, [VŽ94, Ž04]. As shown in [VŽ94] the complex $[4] * [n] * [n]$ is almost 3-embeddable into $\mathbb{R}^3$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

4.2 From Tverberg unavoidable to r-unavoidable

In this brief section we demonstrate that r-unavoidability is indeed a good combinatorial 'replacement' for the concept 'Tverberg unavoidable for f' used in [BFZ].

More precisely the Theorem 3.9 (or its companion Theorem 3.6) are sufficiently strong to have as corollaries some of the key technical results obtained in [BFZ] by the 'constraint method'.

Proposition 4.8. (cf. [BFZ, Key lemma ♯2]) *Suppose that K is an r-unavoidable complex on a set of $m = (r-1)(d+2)+1$ vertices where $r \geq 2$ is a prime power and $d \geq 1$. Then for each continuous map $f : K \to \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist r pairwise disjoint simplices $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r$ in K such that $f(\sigma_1) \cap \ldots \cap f(\sigma_r) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof: Following the usual 'configuration space/test map'-scheme [Ž04] the problem is reduced to showing that there does not exist a $(\mathbb{Z}_p)^k$-equivariant map $K_\Delta^r \to S^{(r-1)d-1}$ where $S^{(r-1)d-1} = (S^{r-2})^{*d}$ and $S^{r-2} \cong \partial\Delta[r]$ is essentially the boundary of a simplex on r vertices. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.9,

$$\mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(K_\Delta^r) \geq ((r-1)(d+2)+1)-2r+1 = (r-1)d > (r-1)d-1 = \mathrm{Ind}_G^\sharp(S^{(r-1)d-1}).$$

Remark 4.9. Lemma 4.1 from [BFZ] collects the key examples of 'Tverberg unavoidable complexes' which are 'large enough to be unavoidable for any f', and which are sufficient for all applications in that paper. The authors actually prove that all these complexes are r-unavoidable in the sense of Definition 2.2. For the first three classes (i)-(iii) this is established by the (global) pigeonhole principle. It immediately follows that (i)-(iii) are examples of r-unavoidable complexes which are 'linearly realizable' in the sense of Definition 5.6.

The example (iv) from [BFZ, Lemma 4.1] is not linear, however it is 'concavely realizable' (Definition 2.2), as shown in Example 5.8.

5 Generating r-unavoidable complexes

Theorem 4.6 opens the possibility of reducing the topological problem of finding interesting classes of globally r-non-embeddable complexes to the purely combinatorial question of constructing r-unavoidable complexes. Here we describe some general procedures for tackling this combinatorial problem.

5.1 Linearly realizable r-unavoidable complexes

Definition 5.1. *A (positive) weight distribution (measure) on $[m]$ is a vector $\mu = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m)$ where $\alpha_i \geq 0$ for each i and $\alpha := \alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_m > 0$. The associated positive measure on $2^{[m]}$ (also denoted by μ) is defined by $\mu(A) = \sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i$. If $\mu([m]) = 1$ then the measure μ is referred to as a probability measure.*

More generally a superadditive measure *ν on $2^{[m]}$ is a non-negative function $\nu : 2^{[m]} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\nu(\emptyset) = 0, \nu([m]) > 0$, $A \subset B \Rightarrow \nu(A) \leq \nu(B)$ and,*

$$\nu(A \cup B) \geq \nu(A) + \nu(B) \text{ if } A \cap B = \emptyset. \tag{26}$$

Example 5.2. Suppose that $\{\mu_t\}_{t \in T}$ is a (finite or infinite) collection of positive measures on $[m]$ such that for some $c > 0$, $\mu_t([m]) \geq c$ for each $t \in T$. Then the function defined by,

$$\nu(A) := \mathrm{Inf}_{t \in T}\ \mu_t(A)$$

is a (positive) superadditive measure on $[m]$. These functions will be referred to as *geometric superadditive measures.*

Definition 5.3. *Suppose that $\mu = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m) \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^m$ is a positive measure on $[m]$ and let $\beta \geq 0$. The associated sub-level simplicial complexes $K_{\mu \leq \beta}$ and $K_{\mu < \beta}$, are defined by,*

$$K_{\mu \leq \beta} = \{A \subset [m] \mid \mu(A) \leq \beta\}, \qquad K_{\mu < \beta} = \{A \subset [m] \mid \mu(A) < \beta\}. \tag{27}$$

More generally, if ν is a positive superadditive measure on $[m]$ then the associated sub-level sets,

$$K_{\nu \leq \beta} = \{A \subset [m] \mid \nu(A) \leq \beta\}, \qquad K_{\nu < \beta} = \{A \subset [m] \mid \nu(A) < \beta\}$$

are also simplicial complexes.

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose that ν is a positive superadditive measure on $[m]$ and let $\nu([m]) = \alpha$. Then the sub-level complex $K_{\nu\leq\alpha/r}$ is r-unavoidable.*

Proof: Suppose that $[m] = A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_r$ is a partition. Then at least one of the sets A_i is in $K_{\nu\leq\alpha/r}$, otherwise we would have a contradiction,

$$\alpha = \nu([m]) = \nu(A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_r) \geq \nu(A_1) + \ldots + \nu(A_r) > r\frac{\alpha}{r} = \alpha.$$

Corollary 5.5. *Suppose that ν is a positive superadditive measure on $[m]$ and let $\nu([m]) = \alpha$. Then for each $0 < \beta \leq \alpha$,*

$$\pi(K_{\nu\leq\beta}) \leq \lceil \alpha/\beta \rceil. \tag{28}$$

Definition 5.6. *An r-unavoidable simplicial complex $K \subset 2^{[m]}$ is called* 'linear' *or* 'linearly realizable' *if $K = K_{\mu\leq 1/r}$ for some probability measure μ on $[m]$. The r-unavoidable complexes described in Proposition 5.4 are for similar reasons sometimes referred to as* 'concave' *or* 'concavely realizable' *complexes.*

Proposition 5.7. *Suppose that ν is a geometric superadditive measure on $[m]$ (Example 5.2). Suppose that $\nu([m]) = \alpha$ and let $K = K_{\nu\leq\alpha/r}$ be the associated sub-level r-unavoidable complex. Then K contains a linearly realizable, r-unavoidable complex,*

$$K_{\mu\leq 1/r} \subset K_{\nu\leq\alpha/r}.$$

Proof: Let $\mathbf{1} = (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbf{1}_r = (1/r)(1, \ldots, 1) = (1/r, \ldots, 1/r)$. By assumption ν extends to a concave function $\nu : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ which implies the convexity of the set,

$$D = K_{\nu>\alpha/r} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \nu(v) > \alpha/r\}. \tag{29}$$

If $C = \{\mathbf{1}_r\} - (\mathbb{R}^+)^m = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid v \leq \mathbf{1}_r\}$ then $C \cap D = \emptyset$. Indeed, if $u \in C$ then $\nu(u) \leq \nu(\mathbf{1}_r) = \alpha/r$ while $u \in D$ implies $\nu(u) > \alpha/r$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ be a linear function that separates convex sets C and D,

$$C \subset f^{-1}(-\infty, c] \quad \text{and} \quad D \subset f^{-1}(c, +\infty). \tag{30}$$

From the first inclusion in (30) we deduce that $f(x) \geq 0$ for each $x \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^m$. Moreover $f(\mathbf{1}) = \beta > 0$. By normalizing we observe that the probability measure $\mu = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m)$ defined by $\langle \mu, x \rangle = (1/\beta)f(x)$ has the properties claimed by the proposition. □

By definition the *normalized counting measure* on X, supported by a finite set $S \subset X$ is defined by $\mu_S^X(A) = |A \cap S|/|S|$. If $S = X$ than we say that $\mu_S^S = \mu_S$ is the normalized counting measure on S.

Example 5.8. For a chosen pair of integers $1 \leq p < q$ let μ_1 be the normalized counting measure on $[q]$ and μ_2 the normalized counting measure on $[q]$ supported by $[p]$. Let $\nu = \text{Min}\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$. Then the sub-level complex $K_{\nu\leq 1/r}$ is r-unavoidable and by definition $K_{\nu\leq 1/r} = K_{\mu_1\leq 1/r} \cup K_{\mu_2\leq 1/r}$. This example includes the 'Key example (iv)' from [BFZ, Lemma 4.1] as a special case. By Proposition 5.7 there exists a linearly realizable complex $K' \subset K_{\nu\leq 1/r}$. In other words the r-unavoidability of the complex $K_{\nu\leq 1/r}$ can be established by a careful choice of non-negative weights on the set $[m]$.

5.2 WH-realizable r-unavoidable complexes

'Weighted hypergraph' realizable or WH-realizable r-unavoidable complexes is a class of complexes considerably larger then the class of linearly realizable complexes. Here again we use a weight distribution but the weights may be associated to sets which are not necessarily singletons. A hypergraph $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{[m]}$ is by convention an arbitrary, non-empty family of sets of not necessarily the same cardinality. The k-uniform hypergraph on $[m]$ is the sets $[m]^{(k)} = \binom{[m]}{k} = \{A \subset [m] \mid |A| = k\}$.

Definition 5.9. *Let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{F} \subset 2^{[m]}$ and let $\omega : \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{R}^+ = [0, +\infty)$ be a distribution of non-negative weights on $\mathcal{F}$. Define the associated superadditive measure on $[m]$ by,*

$$\nu_\omega(A) = \mathrm{Sup}\{\omega(A_1) + \ldots + \omega(A_k) \mid A_1 \uplus \ldots \uplus A_k \subseteq A \text{ where } A_i \in \mathcal{F} \text{ for each } i\} \quad (31)$$

If $A \subset [m]$ does not admit a (sub)partition $A \supseteq A_1 \uplus \ldots \uplus A_k$ by elements from $\mathcal{F}$ we set $\nu_\omega(A) = 0$ which is in agreement with $\mathrm{Sup}(\emptyset) = 0 = \mathrm{Min}([0, +\infty))$.

The following proposition is an immediate consequence of the definition.

Proposition 5.10. *The measure ν_ω is superadditive, i.e.*

$$\nu_\omega(A \cup B) \geq \nu_\omega(A) + \nu_\omega(B)$$

for each pair $A, B \subset [m]$ such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$.

Definition 5.11. *An r-unavoidable complex $K \subset 2^{[m]}$ is WH-realizable or 'weighted hypergraph realizable' if for some hypergraph $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{[m]}$, an associated weight distribution $\omega : \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, and the corresponding superadditive measure ν_ω,*

$$K = K_{\nu_\omega \leq \alpha/r}$$

where $\alpha = \nu_\omega([m])$. The pair $(\mathcal{F}, \omega)$ is referred to as the WH-realization of the r-unavoidable complex K.

Example 5.12. Suppose that $\mathcal{F} = \{\{i\} \mid i \in [m]\}$ is the collection of all one-element subsets (singletons) in $[m]$. Then for each weight distribution $\omega : \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ the associated superadditive measure ν_ω is additive and we recover the class of linearly realizable, r-unavoidable complexes introduced in Section 5.1.

In light of Example 5.12 it is quite natural to ask for examples of WH-realizable, r-unavoidable complexes which are *not* linearly realizable. It is quite clear that this class is considerably bigger than the class of linearly realizable complexes. The following proposition shows that this is true already in the case of 2-unavoidable complexes.

Proposition 5.13. *Each self-dual complex $K \subset 2^{[m]}$ is WH-realizable.*

Proof: Let $\mathcal{F} = 2^{[m]}$ be the collection of all subsets of $[m]$. Define the weight distribution $\omega = \omega_K : 2^{[m]} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ by,

$$\omega(A) = 0 \text{ (respectively 1) if and only if } A \in K \text{ (respectively } A \in K^c).$$

Since K is self-dual, for each $B \subset [m]$ either $B \in K$ or $B^c \in K$ (but not both). It follows from here that $\nu_\omega = \omega$ and in turn $K = K_{\omega=0} = K_{\omega \leq 1/2}$. $\square$

Proposition 5.14. *Suppose that for a given $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{[m]}$ and a weight distribution $\omega : \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ there exists $X \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\omega(X) = 0$. Then $\nu_\omega = \nu_{\omega'}$ where $\omega' : \mathcal{F} \setminus \{X\}$ is the restriction of ω.*

Proposition 5.14 is elementary however it has some important consequences. The following corollary suggests that there is an increasing hierarchy of WH-realizable, r-unavoidable complexes. In particular, for a given r-realizable complex K, it may be desirable to find its $(\mathcal{F}, \omega)$-realization with $\mathcal{F}$ of the smallest size (or minimizing some other complexity).

Corollary 5.15. *For a given m and $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{[m]}$, let $R_r(\mathcal{F})$ be the class of all WH-realizable, r-unavoidable subcomplexes of $2^{[m]}$. Then $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}'$ implies $R_r(\mathcal{F}) \subset R_r(\mathcal{F}')$.*

5.3 Other classes of r-unavoidable complexes

Here we describe a procedure for generating non-realizable, r-unavoidable simplicial complexes based on Ramsey's theorem and its relatives. The method is quite general and links in an unusual way topological combinatorics with Ramsey theory. The following example explains 'in a nutshell' the central idea of the construction.

Example 5.16. The simplest Ramsey type theorem says that for each graph Γ on six vertices either Γ or its complement contain a triangle as a subgraph (triangle = clique with three vertices).

We describe a non-realizable 2-unavoidable complex L on the set $V = \binom{[6]}{2}$ of all 2-element subsets of [6]. By definition $S \subset V$ is in L if and only if there is a triangle in the complement of S. It is clear that L is a simplicial complex. Moreover, Ramsey's theorem $R(3,3) = 6$ implies that L is 2-unavoidable.

Let us show that this complex is non-realizable. Suppose that each edge $\{i,j\} \in \binom{[6]}{2}$ is associated a variable $x_{i,j}$ (where $i \neq j$ and $x_{i,j} = x_{j,i}$).

For contradiction suppose that the complex L is realizable, meaning that there exists a system of non-negative weights $\mu = (x_{1,2}, x_{1,3} \ldots, x_{5,6})$ such that $\sum_{i<j} x_{i,j} = 1$ and $K_{\mu<1/2} \subset L$. It follows that if $S \notin L$ then $\sum_{(i,j)\in S} x_{i,j} \geq 1/2$. Figure 5.16 on the left displays a graph without triangles which means that the complementary graph (on the right) is not in L. In particular,

$$x_{1,3} + x_{3,5} + x_{1,5} + x_{2,4} + x_{4,6} + x_{2,6} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{32}$$

By the same argument we have for each permutation $\pi : [6] \to [6]$ the corresponding inequality,

$$x_{\pi_1,\pi_3} + x_{\pi_3,\pi_5} + x_{\pi_1,\pi_5} + x_{\pi_2,\pi_4} + x_{\pi_4,\pi_6} + x_{\pi_2,\pi_6} \geq \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1\leq i<j\leq 6} x_{i,j}. \tag{33}$$

This is a contradiction since by averaging inequalities (33) over all permutations of [6] we obtain the inequality $6/15 \geq 1/2$. □



Figure 1: A maximal graph without triangles and its complement.

Suppose that P is a graph property which is monotone in the sense that if $\Gamma \in P$ and $\Gamma \subset \Gamma'$ then $\Gamma' \in P$. For example 'having triangles' (or cliques of given size) is such a property. If the set of vertices is fixed, we frequently identify a graph with its set of edges.

Definition 5.17. *Choose $r \geq 2$ and denote by $\binom{[n]}{2}$ the set of all 2-element subsets of $[n]$. We say that an integer n is (P, r)-admissible if for each partition (coloring)*

$$\binom{[n]}{2} = A_1 \uplus A_2 \uplus \ldots \uplus A_r \tag{34}$$

of $\binom{[n]}{2}$ into r disjoint sets, for some i the graph $\cup_{j \neq i} A_j$ has the property P.

For example if P is the property that the graph has a clique of size k then n is (k, r)-admissible if for each coloring (34) there exists a set $C \subset [n]$ of size k such that $\binom{C}{2}$ is colored by at most $(k-1)$ colors (at least one of the colors is missed).

The following proposition extends the idea of Example 5.16 to the case of r-unavoidable complexes.

Proposition 5.18. *Suppose that n is (P, r)-admissible. Let L be the simplicial complex defined on the set $V = \binom{[n]}{2}$ (as the set of vertices) where $S \in L$ if and only if the complement $S^c = \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus S$ of S has the property P. Then the simplicial complex L is r-unavoidable.*

Proof: If (34) is a partition of the set of vertices $\binom{[n]}{2}$ of L then at least one of the sets $\cup_{j \neq i} A_j$ has the property P (Definition 5.17) which means that the corresponding $A_i \in L$. □

Remark 5.19. It is expected that the r-unavoidable complexes described in Proposition 5.18 are often non-realizable. Indeed, in the opposite case we would be able to prove Ramsey type statements by a simple counting argument (using a system of non-negative weights $x_{i,j}$ on edges $\{i, j\}$).

5.4 Concluding remarks

The presentation of different classes of r-unavoidable complexes in Section 2 is introductory and serves to illustrate some of the natural constructions and important classes of these objects. A more detailed presentation is postponed for a subsequent publication where we also plan to include a 'topological analysis' of related objects and constructions used in social choice theory and game theory.

References

[AMSW] S. Avvakumov, I. Mabillard, A. Skopenkov, U. Wagner. Eliminating higher-multiplicity intersections, III. Codimension 2, arXiv:1511.03501 [math.GT].

[BMZ] P.V.M. Blagojević, B. Matschke, G.M. Ziegler. Optimal bounds for the colored Tverberg problem. arXiv:0910.4987v2 [math.CO].

[BFZ] P.V.M. Blagojević, F. Frick, G.M. Ziegler. Tverberg plus constraints. *B. London Math. Soc.*, 46:953–967, 2014.

[BFZ-2] P.V.M. Blagojević, F. Frick, G.M. Ziegler. Counterexamples to the topological Tverberg conjecture and other applications of the constraint method, in preparation.

[F] F. Frick. Counterexamples to the topological Tverberg conjecture. arXiv:1502.00947v1 [math.CO].

[Ga-Pa] P. Galashin, G. Panina. Simple game induced manifolds, arXiv:1311.6966 [math.GT].

[G10] M. Gromov. Singularities, expanders and topology of maps. Part 2: From combinatorics to topology via algebraic isoperimetry, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 20 (2010) 416-526.

[Gr69] B. Grünbaum. Imbeddings of simplicial complexes, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 44 (1969) 502–513.

[JVZ-1] D. Jojić, S.T. Vrećica, R.T. Živaljević. Multiple chessboard complexes and the colored Tverberg problem. arXiv:1412.0386 [math.CO].

[JVZ-2] D. Jojić, S.T. Vrećica, R.T. Živaljević. Symmetric multiple chessboard complexes and a new theorem of Tverberg type. arXiv:1502.05290v2 [math.CO].

[MW14] I. Mabillard and U. Wagner. Eliminating Tverberg points, I; An analogue of the Whitney trick. In *Proc. 30th Ann. Symp. on Computational Geometry* (2014), pp. 171–180.

[MW15] I. Mabillard, U. Wagner. Eliminating Higher-Multiplicity Intersections, I. A Whitney Trick for Tverberg-Type Problems, Preprint, 46 pages, arXiv:1508.02349, August 2015.

[MW16] I. Mabillard, U. Wagner. Eliminating Higher-Multiplicity Intersections, II. The Deleted Product Criterion in the r-Metastable Range, arXiv:1601.00876 [math.GT].

[M03] J. Matoušek. *Using the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem. Lectures on Topological Methods in Combinatorics and Geometry*. Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2003 (Corrected 2nd printing 2008).

[Mel11] S.A. Melikhov. Combinatorics of embeddings, arXiv:1103.5457v2 [math.GT].

[vNM44] J. Von Neumann, O. Morgenstern. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, Princeton University Press (1944).

[Öz87] M. Özaydin. Equivariant maps for the symmetric group, Preprint 1987, 17p.

[PS07] B. Peleg, P. Sudhölter. *Introduction to the Theory of Cooperative Games*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.

[R90] K.G. Ramamurthy. *Coherent Structures and Simple Games*, Springer Netherlands, 1990.

[Sc93] G. Schild. Some minimal nonembeddable complexes, *Topology Appl.* 3 (1993), no. 2, 177-185.

[Vol96] A. Yu. Volovikov. On a topological generalization of the Tverberg theorem. *Math. Notes*, 59(3):324326, 1996. Translation from *Mat. Zametki* 59, No.3, 454-456 (1996).

[VŽ94] S. Vrećica and R. Živaljević. New cases of the colored Tverberg theorem. In H. Barcelo and G. Kalai, editors, *Jerusalem Combinatorics '93*, Contemporary Mathematics Vol. 178, pp. 325–334, A.M.S. 1994.

[VŽ11] S. Vrećica, R. Živaljević. Chessboard complexes indomitable. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 118(7):2157–2166, 2011.

[Zi11] G.M. Ziegler. $3N$ colored points in a plane. *Notices of the A.M.S.* Vol. 58 , Number 4, 550–557, 2011.

[ŽV92] R.T. Živaljević and S.T. Vrećica. The colored Tverberg's problem and complexes of injective functions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 61(2):309–318, 1992.

[Živ98] R. Živaljević. User's guide to equivariant methods in combinatorics, I and II. *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.)*, (I) 59(73):114–130, 1996 and (II) 64(78):107–132, 1998.

[Ž98] R.T. Živaljević. Combinatorics of topological posets. *Advances in Applied Math.* 21, 547–574 (1998).

[Ž04] R.T. Živaljević. Topological methods. Chapter 14 in *Handbook of Discrete and Computational Geometry*, J.E. Goodman, J. O'Rourke, eds, Chapman & Hall/CRC 2004, 305–330.

[Ž15] R.T. Živaljević. An inviation to continuous combinatorics. *Fundamental and Applied Mathematics*, Yuri Petrovich Solovyov memorial volume (arXiv).